

[illegible]

NATIONAL CENSUS TEST

**TEST DU
RECENSEMENT
NATIONAL**

Report No. 18

Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, and Question 4: Coverage

NATIONAL CENSUS TEST

ANALYSIS REPORT

COVERAGE QUESTIONS

August, 1989

The principal author of this report is Don Royce. The author wishes to thank Alain Théberge and Julie Trépanier for their valuable assistance in the analysis.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The National Census Test included five questions/instructions related to coverage: a household roster (Step 2), the number of Temporary Residents (Step 3), any persons left out (Step 4), an instruction to copy the persons from the roster to Question 1 (Step 6) and usual place of residence (Question 4).

Response rates were generally good to very good for the coverage questions. In particular, response rates for Step 3 and Step 4 were much better than for the 1986 versions of these questions.

The NCT identified approximately 400,000 Temporary Residents, considerably higher than in 1986. However the two questions identifying Temporary Residents (Step 3 and Question 4) showed a fairly high degree of inconsistency. As well, 20% of Temporary Residents reported in Question 4 of the NCT gave a different response in the re-interview. Nevertheless, the inclusion of Temporary Residents has the potential to add up to an additional 66,000 persons to the Census count (representing a reduction of about 0.25% in the undercoverage rate).

The number of Foreign Residents identified was approximately 84,000. The NCT approach, which classifies persons as usual residents, Foreign Residents or Temporary Residents based on their response to Question 4, is clearly including many persons (e.g., foreign students and persons on work permits) as usual residents who were formerly counted as Foreign Residents.

For 1991, it is recommended that Steps 2, 3 and 4 be asked with minor changes from the NCT. It is not recommended that Question 4 be asked. Rather, the 1986 approach to identifying and screening out Temporary and Foreign Residents should be used. This recommendation is based on the concerns with the quality of response to Question 4, as well as the major operational implications, which have not been examined in detail, for Collection and Processing. It is also recommended, however, that the approach of including Temporary Residents on the Form 2 be pursued for 1996, in view of the long-term potential for coverage improvement that was demonstrated by the NCT.

1. Introduction

This report presents the analysis and recommendations for the coverage-related questions and instructions included in the November 1988 National Census Test. By "coverage-related" we mean those questions and instructions on the Census questionnaire and in the Guide designed to ensure that no persons are missed within those households that receive a questionnaire. Since approximately half of the population undercoverage results from persons who are missed within households that are otherwise enumerated, such questions and instructions are an important component of efforts to improve the coverage of the Census.

Section 2 of the report describes the coverage questions and instructions used in the 1986 (and 1981) Census. Section 3 describes the modifications that were made for the National Census Test, while the results and analysis from the test are presented in section 4. Section 5 gives our recommendations for the 1991 Census.

The NCT coverage-related items reported on in this report are Step 2 (Household roster), Step 3 (Number of Temporary Residents), Step 4 (Anyone left out) and Question 4 (Usual Place of Residence).

2. 1986 Coverage Questions and Instructions

2.1 Description of Questions and Instructions

The 1986 and 1981 Censuses included six items/questions related to population coverage:

1. Whole household Temporary Residents.

This was an instruction to Temporary Residents (with a short explanation of what the term means) which appeared on the front cover. The instruction stated that if the entire household was composed of Temporary Residents, the number of Temporary Residents should be entered in the answer box and the questionnaire returned. Collection procedures then required a follow-up by the Census Representative to complete a Form 3 for each Temporary Resident.

2. Whole household Foreign Residents.

This was a instruction to Foreign Residents, with a fairly detailed definition of what the term means. The instruction appeared on the front cover, just below the one for Temporary Residents. If the entire household was composed of Foreign Residents, then the answer box was to be checked and the questionnaire returned. No further follow-up was required in this case.

3. Name (Question 1)

Space was provided for up to six persons to be listed. Fairly detailed (half of an 8.5 by 11 inch page) instructions were given on whom should and should not be listed, the order in which they should be listed and what to do if the

household had more than six persons.

4. Number of usual residents (Question 8b)

Following question 1, the respondent was then to complete the basic demographic information (relationship to Person 1, sex, date of birth, marital status, mother tongue and aboriginal status) for each person, in a matrix format. The respondent then turned the page and was asked question 8, which included four parts. Part b of question 8 asked how many persons usually live here, according to the instructions for Question 1. The number of persons given was then to be checked by the enumerator against the number of persons listed in Question 1. Discrepancies were to be followed up and resolved. Question 8b was also used in Regional Office Processing to reconcile the number of persons listed in Question 1 and the number of persons listed in the Visitation Record.

5. Persons left out (Question 8c)

Part c of question 8 asked if the respondent left anyone out of Question 1 because they were not sure the person should be listed. A "Yes" or non-response to this question was to result in a follow-up to determine whether anyone should be added to the questionnaire.

6. Number of Temporary Residents (Question 8d)

Part d of Question 8 asked for the number of persons with a usual home elsewhere in Canada who were staying or visiting here temporarily. A number (other than zero) or a non-response were to result in a follow-up, and each Temporary Resident was to be enumerated on a Form 3.

2.2 Evaluation of 1986 Questions and Instructions

Because the questions and instructions related to coverage do not generate any data of their own, but are instead used to ensure no one is missed, the essential measure of how well these questions perform is the estimate of undercoverage, particularly that component of undercoverage related to persons missed within enumerated households. As is well known, the level of undercoverage generally went up in 1986 compared to 1981 and previous Censuses. However, it is unlikely that the increase can be attributed in any substantial way to the coverage questions and instructions. The coverage questions and instructions were very similar in 1981 and 1986, with the only major changes being: (i) the Whom to Include instructions preceded the Order of Listing questions in 1986, whereas the reverse was true in 1981; and (ii) the questions 8b, 8c and 8d were re-numbered from separate questions in 1981.

Some limited evidence of the respondent understanding and use of the questions and instructions is available from the qualitative research carried out in early 1988. The research found that the terms Temporary Resident and Foreign Resident were not well understood, that respondents tended not to read the instructions, and that questions 8b, 8c and 8d were confusing. A frequent comment on question 8b (number of usual residents) was "What's the matter- can't the computer add

this up?"

More quantitative information is available for questions 8b, 8c and 8d from the 1986 Edit Sample Study (ESS) (Brodeur, Castonguay). First, the study found that these three questions had very high non-response rates which required a great deal of follow-up, the vast majority of which did not lead to any persons being added. Whatever effectiveness the questions might have would have been eroded by the high non-response.

A more detailed comparison of the Edit Sample Study questionnaires with the final questionnaires revealed that question 8b was primarily useful for identifying households where there were more than six persons. The response pattern strongly suggested that whenever there was a discrepancy between 8b and Question 1, it was usually because the respondent did not include themselves in 8b. The evaluation of 8c suggested that the question was only marginally useful, although the sample size was very small. Many of the persons listed here had in fact already been listed in Question 1. Finally, for question 8d there was a 60% discrepancy between the number of persons reported as Temporary Residents in 8d and the final number of Temporary Residents after follow-up. It is impossible to determine whether this is due to respondent misunderstanding of the meaning of the question, which the CR corrected in follow-up, or whether it is because CRs did not or could not conduct follow-up for these cases.

It is clear, however, that the 1986 questions needed improvement, particularly question 8b, 8c and 8d. Section 3 describes the approach tested in the NCT.

3. National Census Test Coverage Questions and Instructions

There were five questions/instructions related to coverage in the National Census Test:

1. Household Roster (Step 2)

This item was Step 2 of the NCT questionnaire, immediately following the address of the dwelling. It asked the respondent to make a list of all persons living or staying there as of Census Test Day.

It was felt that because most respondents perceive the primary purpose of the Census to be a head count, making the listing of household members an early step was a natural one. The use of a specific instruction ("Make a list...") was intended to emphasize the importance of the process of listing household members. Space was provided for up to twelve names, with an instruction to use the Comments section if there were more than twelve people. It was felt that this would make the identification of households with more than six persons easier than the old instructions and question 8b, with the bonus that the names of the additional persons would be available to the CR when they went back to do the follow-up.

The roster question also included the Whom to Include and Order of Listing instructions. The number of instructions was considerably reduced, however,

in an attempt to get respondents to read and understand the basic instructions without the distraction of a lot of special cases. An instruction to see the Guide for special situations was given.

Respondents were also instructed to include persons who were staying or visiting temporarily in the roster (i.e. Temporary Residents). The rationale for this is described in Question 4 below. Also, unlike 1986, there was no instruction to exclude Foreign Residents.

2. Number of Temporary Residents (Step 3)

The main change to the question on the number of Temporary Residents was its placement. It followed the roster question and, as Temporary Residents were to be included in the roster, its function changed to that of a probe for the roster. If Temporary Residents were reported, the respondent was asked to add their names to the roster if he/she had not already done so. It was felt that the early placement of the question, as well as making it a separate step, would help reduce the non-response rate from the level of 25% observed in 1986.

3. Persons left out (Step 4)

Again, the major change to this question was its placement. It followed Step 4, thus becoming a more direct probe for Step 2. The space allotted to the question was also increased substantially. The examples were dropped in an effort to simplify the question.

4. Name (Question 1/Step 6)

Question 1 in the NCT was to be completed by the respondent simply by copying the names from the list in Step 2. The instruction to do this was Step 6. To simplify the test, households with more than six persons were instructed to copy the first six names only. In the Census itself, of course, Step 6 would have to be modified to instruct the respondent to continue on a second questionnaire (see Appendix 2).

5. Usual Place of Residence (Question 4)

This question asked each person to report what they considered to be their usual home, with the categories "Here", "No usual home", "Outside Canada" and "Elsewhere in Canada". The primary purpose of this question was to classify each person as either a usual resident (comprised of the first two categories), Foreign Resident or a Temporary Resident. In addition, persons reporting "Elsewhere in Canada" were asked for the exact location of their usual residence. Only usual residents were instructed to continue with the rest of the questionnaire. The only information collected for Foreign and Temporary Residents would therefore be name, sex, date of birth and (for Temporary Residents only) address.

It should be noted that this method of classifying respondents into usual residents, Foreign Residents and Temporary Residents is considerably different than the approach used in 1981 and 1986. It is based on the respondent's own

perception of their usual place of residence, whereas the 1986 Census approach was based on defining Temporary Residents and Foreign Residents on the front cover and having these persons screen themselves out right at the start.

4. Results From the National Census Test

4.1 Step 2 (Household Roster)

The initial non-response rate to the question was 1.9% according to the Response Rate Sample Study. This is a considerable improvement over the version tested in MT-1, where the non-response rate was 6.3%. Since it was a new question, this rate is not comparable to anything in the 1986 Census (no response rates are available for Name, for example). However it replaces a question (8b in 1986) which had a non-response rate of 14.2%.

One of the uses of the roster will be to trigger a follow-up either when there are more than six persons in the household and no second questionnaire, or when there are six or less but there is a discrepancy with Question 1. Of households where the roster was completed, 1.1% had more than six persons; this compares to 1.2% in the 1986 Census. For households of size six or less, the question needs less follow-up than did Question 8b in 1986. In 1986, 1.8% of households required follow-up, compared to 1.4% for the NCT. Furthermore, the reason for this follow-up has changed. In 1986, approximately three quarters of the follow-up was for the case where 8b was less than Question 1; as mentioned earlier this was often because the respondent apparently forgot to count him/herself. In the NCT, only about one-third of the follow-up was for the case where Step 2 was less than Question 1.

A study was undertaken of those questionnaires where Step 2 and Question 1 disagreed. First, of the cases where Step 2 was greater than Question 1 (Table 1), about 80% turned out to have resulted from a failure to capture the person in Question 1. This is likely due to the nature of the data capture program, where all the data for a person was captured column-wise before going back to Question 1 for the next person. Another 7-8% were due to clerical errors in coding of Step 2. Thus, the actual follow-up rate for this case would only be about 0.1 %. Second, for the cases where Step 2 was less than Question 1 (Table 2), almost half were due to a coding or capture error in Step 2. Approximately 40% were cases where Question 1 did contain additional persons not listed in Step 2; in some of these cases the persons had been listed in Step 4 (persons left out). It may be that re-copying the names from Step 2 to Question 1 results in the addition of some persons, although there is no direct proof of this.

Although it is often difficult to determine the reasons for discrepancies between Step 2 and Question 1, it can be concluded that:

1. the actual rate of discrepancy which the CR will have to follow up should be minimal (of the order of 0.3%); and
2. data capture procedures will have to be designed to ensure that persons are not lost at Question 1. Capturing page-by-page would probably be preferable. The number of persons listed in Step 2 should be captured and used as a check on the number of persons to be captured.

For an analysis of household size, see section 4.5.

4.2 Step 3 (Temporary Residents)

Table 3 shows the basic responses to Step 3 (according to the Response Rate Sample Study) and the comparable question 8d from the 1986 Census Edit Sample Study. As is evident, the response rate has improved considerably. In addition the percentage of households reporting Temporary Residents has increased from 1.8% to 2.3%, despite the test being held in November. The number of Temporary Residents is just under 400,000. Although a completely comparable figure is not available from the 1986 ESS, the number of Forms 3 received in Head Office from private households was 122,430.

In order to assess the quality of response, the consistency with the number of Temporary Residents according to the response to Question 4 was examined (Table 4). (Only cases where six or less Temporary Residents were reported are included). Overall, the agreement was 97.4%, indicating that follow-up by the CR would only be required for 2.6% of the responses to Step 3. However a high proportion of the cases that agree represent the case where no Temporary Residents are present. When Temporary Residents are reported in both Step 3 and Question 4, the agreement rate drops to 88.3%. When Temporary Residents are reported in Step 3, Question 4 agrees 57.8% of the time. When Temporary Residents are reported in Question 4, Step 3 agrees only 44.2% of the time. The most frequent type of discrepancy is when Temporary Residents are reported in Step 3 but not Question 4 or vice versa.

Cases where Step 3 was greater than the number of Temporary Residents from Question 4 were examined. Table 5 gives the results. In about one-fifth of the cases, the discrepancy was traced to the processing of the NCT questionnaire, the most frequent cause being a failure to capture a person listed in Question 1. The remainder of cases were attributed to response errors, but in almost half of the total cases there was no obvious explanation (one possibility appears to be that respondents missed the "elsewhere in Canada" qualification in Step 3 and reported the number of persons listed in Step 2.) In many cases, the respondent appeared to have reported the Temporary Residents under the categories "No usual home" or "Outside Canada" in Question 4.

4.3 Step 4 (Persons Left Out)

As Table 6 indicates, the response rate for this question has also been substantially improved compared to the 1986 Edit Sample Study. The reduction in non-response has gone almost completely to the "No" category. As well, because Temporary Residents were to be listed, there may have been fewer doubtful cases for the respondent to list in Step 4. This suggests that the edit rule for this question could be simplified so that only "Yes" answers are followed up (non-response was also to be followed-up in 1986).

Questionnaires with a "Yes" answer were examined and the results are presented in Table 7. Of a total of 291 "Yes" responses, 33 cases (11.3%) were identified where it appeared that follow-up had correctly added persons. This is approximately the same as the 1986 Edit Sample Study where 6 out of 62 "Yes" responses (9.7%) resulted in additions. There were 38 cases where persons should have been added but were not, however.

There were 147 cases where persons were listed in Step 4 who should not have been included in Step 2. The most frequent reason was persons who were not usual residents of the dwelling and who were not there on Census Day (primarily ex-spouses, children, and visitors around Census Day). Other frequent cases involved students and persons in an institution for six months or more. Also listed, however, were four household pets, three persons not yet born, and one person who had died! Of the 147 cases, there were 13 cases where persons were added to Step 2 when they should not have been. Nine of these were students who lived elsewhere.

In summary, the response rate has been greatly improved, but the overall effectiveness in terms of directly improving coverage does not appear to have changed substantially.

4.4 Question 4 (Usual Place of Residence)

Table 8 presents the initial results to the question prior to edit and follow-up by the interviewer, from the Response Rate Sample Study. The non-response rate is moderately, but not unacceptably high. The relatively high rate of multiple response was noticed during processing and appeared to be primarily due to respondents marking "Here" but repeating their address again in the space provided for Temporary Residents. The Response Rate Sample Study also noted that a high proportion (68 out of 78) of Temporary and Foreign Residents missed the End Here instruction and completed the rest of the questionnaire.

Table 9 gives the response pattern after follow-up. The rate of non-response is now less than one percent, including those cases where only the address information is given (the correct response could be determined in many of these cases). The only appreciable rate of multiple response is the case where "Here" is checked and the address is repeated. This case is easily treated at Edit and Imputation.

For the NCT, multiple responses were resolved by a simple algorithm which gave first priority to the response "Here", second priority to "No usual home", third priority to "Elsewhere in Canada" and fourth priority to "Outside Canada". Non-response was assigned the value "Here". The results are shown in Table 10. The number of foreign residents (84,054) is low compared to administrative figures on work permits and student visas, although university campuses were not in scope for the NCT. Nevertheless, it certainly appears that many persons who are Foreign Residents according to the definition used in previous Censuses would be counted as usual residents under the approach of Question 4.

There were also an estimated 413,098 Temporary Residents identified by Question 4. In order to check the validity of these responses, the address information was checked for a one-fifth sample of these persons. Of the 249 cases in the sample that were examined, there were only three where the address was the same as Step 1, suggesting that the category was well understood. The quality of the address was also examined and the results appear in Table 11. Exact addresses were given in slightly over half the cases. The date of birth information was also good, with 227 out of 249 giving a complete day, month and year answer.

Table 12 shows the distribution of household size and average household sizes from a number of sources. The first column gives the distribution according to Step 2, including Temporary and Foreign Residents. Column 2 gives the distribution according to Question 4, again including Temporary and Foreign Residents, but with a maximum value of six. Note that the limit of six persons in Question 4 results in some heaping at the value of six compared to Step 2. The third column gives the distribution of the number of usual residents according to Question 4, again with a maximum of six persons. The heaping at six persons is again evident. Finally, the fourth column gives the distribution according to the 1986 Census. The 1986 Census figures refer to usual residents in private households in the ten provinces.

The average household size according to Step 2 was 2.718. The average household size for the ten provinces in the 1986 Census was 2.754. However this comparison is complicated by two factors. First, Step 2 includes Temporary Residents and Foreign residents. Second, the average household size has declined since June 1986. The first can largely be adjusted for by subtracting the number of Foreign Residents and Temporary Residents reported in Question 4; this gives an average household size of 2.658. The second can be adjusted for by subtracting an estimate of the decrease in average household size. According to the May 1986 and November 1988 Labour Force Survey results, the decrease was 0.05, giving an adjusted figure of 2.704. Thus, the Step 2 average household size is less than the Census by $2.704 - 2.658 = 0.05$ approximately. The standard error of the estimate of average household size is approximately 0.01 (assuming no design effect), so this difference is of concern.

When using Question 4, comparisons of household size are only valid when the household size is five or less, since all household sizes of six or more have been included in the size six category. The last line of Table 12 shows the average size for households of five persons or less. A comparison of Step 2 and Question 4 (All types of resident) shows a close agreement between the two. Step 2 is slightly larger, but this may be because the 91,192 households with a non-response or zero in Step 2 are small, possibly one-person, households. This is suggested by a comparison of the detailed distribution. The difference between Question 4 (Usual Residents) and the 1986 Census is approximately 0.05, which could be accounted for by the decline in average household size since June 1986, assuming most of the decline occurred in households of size five or less.

In summary, the situation concerning household size is mixed. There is some cause for concern since there remains an unexplainable gap of about 0.05 persons per household overall. However, this difference would appear to be concentrated in the larger households, since the gap between Question 4 (Usual residents) and the 1986 Census for households of five persons or less does appear to be largely explainable. The limitations of the test make it difficult to draw any clear conclusions for larger households, however. Also, the fact that some person columns were not captured for some households adds to the uncertainty.

4.5 Results From the Re-interview

Prior to the re-interview, the LFS interviewer was to copy the list of names from Step 2 of the NCT questionnaire to Column A of the re-interview questionnaire. Columns B (age 15 or over) and D (NCT respondent) were also to be completed prior

to the re-interview. At the time of the re-interview, the interviewer attempted to contact the NCT respondent. As the first question of the re-interview, the interviewer was to read the list of names, and then ask the respondent if there was anyone else living or staying there as of November 4th. A number of probes were read, specifically Other relatives, A nanny or other employee, Roomers or boarders, Someone away on business or holiday, Someone away for some other reason, for example, in hospital, and a Visitor who stayed overnight. The objective was to estimate the proportion and types of persons left out of the original NCT questionnaire.

Table 13 shows the results to Question 1 (all re-interview results are unweighted data). Two percent of households reported additional persons, the main reasons being other relatives, followed by persons away for other reasons, and visitors. These persons were to be added to the re-interview roster below the double line in rows 13 to 18. Table 14 shows a cross tabulation of the number of persons added by the response to Question 1. Table 14 exhibits a high degree of inconsistency. Of the 52 households where persons should have been added according to Question 1, persons were added in only 27 households. Also, of the 39 households where persons were added, 12 of these were cases where the response to Question 1 was no or a non-response. It certainly appears that the procedures for Question 1 were not properly understood or followed. An examination of some of the questionnaires showed that persons were often added in the wrong location or not at all. About all that can be derived is a general indication of the types of people that tend to be left out, as given by Table 13.

A further indication of the quality of this aspect of the re-interview comes from a cross-tabulation (Table 15) of Step 2 from the NCT questionnaire and the re-interview roster excluding any below-the-line additions. In theory, the number of persons listed in each list should be the same, since the re-interview list was simply copied from Step 2. However, Step 2 is systematically higher than the re-interview. According to Step 2, there were 7106 persons in the 2,570 households with a response to both Step 2 and the re-interview. According to the re-interview, there were only 6,543 persons, a drop of almost 8 percent.

Question 2 of the re-interview re-asked Question 4 (usual place of residence) in order to obtain a measure of consistency. All questionnaires with a discrepancy were examined, and in some cases the discrepancy was found to be due to a data capture error. Table 16 shows the cross-tabulation of usual place of residence from the two questions after correction of these capture errors.

Of 5,891 persons who said that their usual place of residence was "Here" in the NCT and gave a response in the re-interview, 99.7% gave the same response. Of 73 persons who said that their usual place of residence was "Elsewhere in Canada", 79.5% gave the same response. Most of the ones who changed responses moved to the "Here" category. Although the sample size is small, the rate of inconsistency is high enough to be of concern. An examination of the questionnaires where there was a discrepancy indicated that the correct response was about equally split between the NCT and the re-interview.

Question 3 of the re-interview asked, for Temporary and Foreign Residents, the main reason the person was staying here. Table 17 indicates that the most common reason was visiting, followed by going to school.

5. Recommendations

The major issue for the 1991 coverage questions is the approach to be taken for Temporary and Foreign Residents. The two options are to include them on the Census questionnaire and then identify them by a question on usual place of residence (the NCT approach), or to screen them out right at the start by means of instructions similar to those used in 1986 and 1981. In making a recommendation for 1991, we must assess the quality of response to Question 4, the operational implications of including them on the questionnaire, and the potential benefits to be achieved in terms of improved coverage.

In terms of quality, the number of Foreign Residents identified on the basis of usual place of residence is certainly lower than the number of Foreign Residents according to the definition used in the past. However this is not inconsistent with the recent recommendation that inclusion in the Census should be on the basis of usual place of residence. For Temporary Residents, the response is generally encouraging. Many more are reported than with previous procedures and the quality of address information is generally good. However there was some evidence of inconsistency of response, both in relation to Step 3 and in the re-interview.

In terms of operational implications, there is no doubt that the NCT approach would mean a major change to procedures. First, all procedures in Collection and Processing that distinguish between usual residents, Temporary Residents and Foreign Residents would probably have to be eliminated. Control procedures which formerly distinguished between these three groups would now only control on the total number of residents. The implications of this have not been examined in detail to make sure that it is possible. Second, in order to maintain data integrity it would be necessary to data capture the data for Temporary and Foreign residents as well as usual residents (the address of Temporary Residents would not be captured however). This would add about 500,000 persons to be captured. As noted earlier, a high proportion of Temporary and Foreign Residents did not end where instructed to, and completed the entire questionnaire. Third, a final count of usual, Temporary and Foreign Residents would not be available until Question 4 is processed through Edit and Imputation. Thus, production of final population counts would likely be delayed compared to previous Censuses, probably to about July 1992. As well, preliminary population counts would likely have to include Temporary and Foreign Residents with the idea of deleting them later from the final counts. Users might not understand why their final population counts could go down, instead of up as in the past. Finally, the methodology for the Temporary Residents study would be affected. It would require additional access to the Forms 2 during Head Office Processing when there is competition for questionnaires from several other operations.

In terms of potential benefits, it appears that the NCT method may pick up as many as 300,000 additional Temporary Residents. Assuming that they have the same "missed" rate as in the 1986 Census (22%), then the NCT approach could add up to an additional 66,000 persons to the Census count. As well, basic age-sex data would be available for Temporary and Foreign residents.

Based on the above considerations, it is recommended that:

1. For 1991 we take a conservative approach and use an approach similar to 1986; i.e., do not include Temporary or Foreign Residents on the questionnaire. The improvements to the screening question for Temporary Residents should lead to at least some improvement in the number of Temporary Residents captured.
2. Between 1991 and 1996, undertake a thorough investigation of the operational implications of using the NCT approach with a view to making the change in the 1996 Census.
3. As part of the questionnaire testing for 1996, test the possibility of obtaining information on Temporary Residents in a separate part of the questionnaire. Usual residents, Temporary Residents and Foreign Residents would all be included on the questionnaire but would be kept separate. This would accomplish the goal of capturing the required information for Temporary Residents on the Form 2 with less risk of mixing them up with usual residents and thereby possibly losing some usual residents.

As for the other coverage questions, it is recommended that they be asked much as in the NCT. Step 2 would be modified to refer only to usual residents, and Step 3 would therefore become a stand-alone question, as in 1986. The order of Steps 3 and 4 would be reversed, since Step 3 would no longer be a probe for Step 2. Step 6, the instruction to copy the names, would be modified to cover the case when there are more than six persons in the household.

Complete suggested wordings for Steps 2, 3 4 and 6 are given in Appendix 2.

6. References

Brodeur, Marie. Edit Sample Study of the 1986 Census. Social Survey Methods Division, January 1988.

Castonguay, Diane. Résultats de l'étude des questions de couverture provenant de l'Etude de l'Echantillon de Contrôle de 1986. Division des Méthodes d'Enquêtes Sociales, Février 1989.

Appendix 1

Tables

Tableau 1: Répartition des questionnaires pour lesquels étape 2 > total
(étape 2 ≤ 6).

	Nbre de quest. non pond.	%	Nbre de quest. pondéré	%
1. LES MEMBRES DE L'ETAPE 2 SE RETROUVENT TOUS A L'ETAPE 6, Y COMPRIS A LA QUESTION 1. IL SEMBLE Y AVOIR EU ERREUR A LA SAISIE DES DONNEES.	242.5 ¹	80.8	58781.4031	77.9
2. LE NOMBRE DE PERSONNES A L'ETAPE 2 EST LE MEME QU'A L'ETAPE 6, MAIS LE NOM DE LA PERSONNE MANQUANTE DANS LE FICHIER DE DONNEES N'ETAIT PAS INSCRIT A LA QUESTION 1.	5.5	1.8	908.5995	1.2
3. LES NOMS DES PERSONNES DECRITES A L'ETAPE 6 ETAIENT BIEN INSCRITS A L'ETAPE 2, MAIS IL Y A EU ERREUR DE CODAGE.	22 ²	7.3	4063.474	5.4
4. LES NOMS DES PERSONNES DECRITES A L'ETAPE 6 ETAIENT BIEN INSCRITS A L'ETAPE 2, MAIS LE CODE ETAIT PLUS OU MOINS LISIBLE.	3	1.0	581.12	0.8
5. IL Y A EU ERREUR A LA SAISIE DES DONNEES RELATIVEMENT AU CODE DE L'ETAPE 2.	1	0.3	182.204	0.2
6. LE REpondant N'A PAS INSCRIT TOUS LES MEMBRES DE L'ETAPE 2 A L'ETAPE 6. ON NE RETROUVE AUCUNE EXPLICATION EVIDENTE.				
6.1-Code d'état final=E.	2	0.7	2624.79	3.5
6.2-Code d'état final=X.	5	1.7	494.866	0.7
7. IL SEMBLE QUE ÇA SOIT L'INTERVIEWER QUI AIT REpondu AU QUESTIONNAIRE. IL N'A PAS DECRIT TOUTES LES PERSONNES DE L'ETAPE 2 A L'ETAPE 6.				
7.1-Code de l'état final=E.	10 ³	3.3	5939.124	7.9
7.2-Code de l'état final=X.	4	1.3	906.728	1.2

8. L'INTERVIEWER A CLAIREMENT INDIQUE QUE LA PERSONNE MAN- QUANTE A L'ETAPE 6 NE DEVAIT PAS ETRE INCLUSE DANS LE QUESTIONNAIRE. AUCUNE MODI- FICATION N'A ETE APPORTEE A L'ETAPE 2 POUR CETTE PERSONNE.	1	0.3	242.06	0.3
9. QUESTIONNAIRE INTROUVABLE.	4	1.3	751.649	1.0
TOTAL	300	100.0	75476.0176	100.0

NOTES

TABLEAU 1

- (1) La précision aux dixièmes dans les deux premières parties du tableau est due à un questionnaire dont deux des personnes à l'étape 2 avaient été oubliées à la saisie des données. Pour une d'entre elles, le nom n'était pas inscrit à la question 1, alors que pour l'autre la question 1 était bien complétée.

De plus, "erreur à la saisie des données" signifie tout simplement qu'on a oublié d'entrer dans le fichier de données des membres du ménage qui étaient pourtant bien inscrits dans le questionnaire.

En général, il s'agit des derniers membres du ménage dans la liste, i.e les résidents temporaires ou étrangers et des enfants âgés de moins de 15 ans. Puisque ceux-ci ne remplissaient pas le questionnaire jusqu'à la fin et la moitié restant ainsi vide, le préposé a peut-être cru qu'il n'y avait plus d'autres personnes à saisir.

- (2) On entend ici par erreur de codage, une réponse dans les deux cases au bas de l'étape 2 ne correspondant pas au nombre total de personnes inscrites à cette étape.
- (3) Est inclus dans cette classe le cas où l'interviewer a rajouté un nom à l'étape 2, mais l'ajout n'a pas été fait à l'étape 6. Le code d'état final était "E".

Sont également inclus les cas pour lesquels l'interviewer n'a pu rejoindre pour cause d'absence ou simplement parce que cette(ces) personne(s) ou le répondant ne voulait(en)t divulguer de renseignements additionnels.

Tableau 2: Répartition des questionnaires pour lesquels étape 2 < total, étape 2 <= 6 et étape 2 ≠ 0. Echantillon de 60 questionnaires parmi 106.

	Nbre de quest. non pond.	%	Nbre de quest. pondéré	%
1. L'ERREUR EST DUE AU CODE DE L'ETAPE 2.	30 ¹	50.0	6864.48	44.8
2. LE REpondant A INSCRIT DES PERSONNES SUPPLEMENTAIRES A L'ETAPE 6 SANS LES AJOUTER A L'ETAPE 2. AUCUNE RAISON PARTICULIERE N'A ETE REMARQUEE.	9	15.0	3696.72	24.2
3. LE REpondant A INSCRIT DES PERSONNES SUPPLEMENTAIRES A L'ETAPE 6 SANS LES AJOUTER A L'ETAPE 2. ON RETROUVAIT LES NOMS DE CES PERSONNES A L'ETAPE 4.	5	8.3	1822.52	11.9
4. L'INTERVIEWER A INSCRIT DES PERSONNES SUPPLEMENTAIRES A L'ETAPE 6 SANS LES AJOUTER A L'ETAPE 2. AUCUNE RAISON PARTICULIERE N'A ETE REMARQUEE.	2	3.3	414.70	2.7
5. L'INTERVIEWER A INSCRIT DES PERSONNES SUPPLEMENTAIRES A L'ETAPE 6 SANS LES AJOUTER A L'ETAPE 2. ON RETROUVAIT CES PERSONNES A L'ETAPE 4.	2	3.3	509.20	3.3
6. LE CODE DE L'ETAPE 2 EST EXACT ET LES PERSONNES INSCRITES A L'ETAPE 2 SE RETROUVENT A L'ETAPE 6. ERREUR A LA SAISIE DES DONNEES DE L'ETAPE 6.	5 ²	8.3	881.51	5.8
7. LE REpondant A MAL INTERPRETE L'ETAPE 6. IL A INSCRIT LES PERSONNES DE L'ETAPE 2 A L'ETAPE 6, MAIS A PAR LA SUITE RECOPIE LA DESCRIPTION DE CHAQUE DES PERSONNES DANS LES AUTRES COLONNES DE LA MATRICE.	3	5.0	359.61	2.3

8. LE REpondant AVAIT OUBLIE LES DEUX PREMIERES PAGES DU QUESTIONNAIRE. L'INTERVIEWER LES A COMPLETEES, MAIS N'A PAS RETRANSCRIT TOUTES LES PERSONNES DE L'ETAPE 6 A L'ETAPE 2.	1 ³	1.7	154.68	1.0
9. DES RAISONS NOUS FONT CROIRE QUE LES PERSONNES SUPPLEMENTAIRES A L'ETAPE 6 N'AURAIENT PAS DU S'Y TROUVER.	2 ²	3.3	394.49	2.6
10. QUESTIONNAIRE INTROUVABLE.	1	1.7	208.32	1.4
TOTAL	60	100.0	15306.23	100.0

NOTES

TABLEAU 2

- (1) Cette catégorie se divise en trois parties:
- (a) Dans 19 cas, le code de l'étape 2 n'égale pas le nombre réel de personnes à cette étape.
 - (b) A l'entrée des données, on n'a pas saisi le bon code à 10 reprises.
 - (c) Le code de l'étape 2 est plus ou moins lisible dans 1 questionnaire.
- (2) Cette partie du tableau représente en fait les cas où l'on retrouve plus de personnes à l'étape 6 dans le fichier de données qu'il y en a en réalité dans le questionnaire correspondant.
- On peut apporter à ces cas l'explication suivante: Lors de la saisie de données, si par erreur le préposé entrait une valeur quelconque pour un numéro de personne qui n'existait pas en réalité, le système imputait une date de naissance et un sexe à cette personne fictive. Un membre supplémentaire au ménage venait alors d'être créé!!
- (3) 1er questionnaire: La personne en question est né le 7 novembre 88. Elle n'habitait certainement pas dans le logement le 4 novembre 88, jour du Test!!
- 2e questionnaire: L'interviewer a mentionné que les personnes en question étaient à l'extérieur depuis plus de 6 mois et ne devaient donc pas être incluses dans le questionnaire.

Table 3: Results For Question on Number of Temporary Residents in the National Census Test (Step 3) and the 1986 Census (Question 8d).

<u>Results</u>	<u>NCT Step 3</u> (percent)	<u>1986 Census Question 8d</u> (percent)
Non-response	4.1	21.4
No temporary residents	93.6	76.9
Temporary residents present	2.3	1.8
Number of temporary residents	385,762	n.a.

Table 4: Number of Households by Number of Temporary Residents in Step 3 and Number of Temporary Residents in Question 4 (for Step 3 \leq 6).

	Question 4							TOTAL	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Step 3	0	9255076	113552	25105	7994	2801	1318	153	9405999
	1	42651	84495	1886	-	-	-	-	129032
	2	16397	3693	30185	103	-	-	-	50378
	3	8145	899	1226	7106	-	-	-	17376
	4	5708	310	2623	695	1352	-	-	10688
	5	2754	346	373	577	810	1320	-	6180
	6	1572	-	-	-	215	-	-	1787
TOTAL	9332303	203295	61398	16475	5178	2638	153	9621440	

Tableau 5: Répartition des questionnaires pour lesquels étape 3a > temp (=nbre de résidents temporaires dans la matrice) lorsque total < 6 (=nbre total de personnes dans la matrice).

	Nbre de quest. non pond.		Nbre de quest. pondéré	
1. ERREURS DE TRAITEMENT.				
1.1-On a oublié de saisir des résidents temporaires à l'entrée des données.				
1.1.1- <i>Les dates de naissance de ces personnes étaient inscrites.</i>	10	5.2	1426.65	2.1
1.1.2- <i>Les dates de naissance de ces personnes ne sont pas connues.</i>	23	12.0	8067.237	11.8
1.2-La case "ailleurs au Canada" de la question 4 était bien cochée. Erreur à la saisie des données.	7	3.6	2423.666	3.5
1.3-Erreur à la saisie relative-ment à l'étape 3a.	3	1.6	1271.69	1.9
1.4-L'étape 3a était illisible ou comportait une réponse multiple.	3	1.6	478.973	0.7
2. ERREURS DE REPONSE.				
2.1-Aucune case de cochée à la question 4; la personne sem- blait être un résident tem- poraire.	5	2.6	814.546	1.2
2.2-Réponse multiple à la ques- tion 4.	2	1.0	307.35	0.4
2.3-Il semble que l'on ait coché "ici" au lieu d'"ailleurs au Canada" à la question 4.	6	3.1	1796.565	2.6

2.4-Le nombre de résidents temporaires à l'étape 3a correspond au nombre de résidents étrangers et/ou sans domicile à l'étape 6.	31 ¹	16.1	13154.523	19.2
2.5-Des résidents temporaires semblent être inclus seulement à l'étape 2, correspondant au nombre indiqué à l'étape 3a.	9	4.7	3761.955	5.5
2.6-On ne retrouve pas aux étapes 2 et 6 les résidents temporaires susceptibles d'être ajoutés. Aucune explication évidente relativement à la réponse de l'étape 3a.	89 ²	46.4	33674.473	49.1
3.AUTRES.				
3.1-Plus d'une personne mentionnée à l'étape 3a. Cas distincts.	3 ³	1.6	1274.547	1.9
3.2-Questionnaire introuvable.	1	0.5	93.680	0.1
TOTAL	192	100.0	68545.855	100.0

NOTES

TABEAU 5

- (1) Un des questionnaires inclus dans cette catégorie ne correspond pas tout à fait à la définition mentionnée. Dans ce questionnaire, il semble bien qu'on ait compté à l'étape 3a des résidents sans domicile habituel plutôt que des résidents temporaires. Par contre, le nombre total de résidents sans domicile habituel à l'étape 6 est supérieure au nombre mentionné à l'étape 3a.
- (2) Je n'ai spécifié que le fait que les résidents temporaires n'étaient pas inclus aux étapes 2 et 6, car il semble qu'à l'occasion certains questionnaires font mention à l'étape 4 de résidents temporaires dont le nombre correspond à celui indiqué à l'étape 3a.

Il m'a semblé également en vérifiant les questionnaires que le répondant ne cochant pas toujours la bonne case à la question 4. Les personnes en cause me semblaient être des résidents temporaires (nom de famille différent ou commentaires quelconques dans le questionnaire).

D'autre part, on remarque dans 47 des 89 cas : étape 3a = étape 2. Il semblerait que le répondant croyait devoir inscrire à l'étape 3a le nombre de personnes dans son ménage plutôt que le nombre de résidents temporaires seulement.

- (3) Répartition pour ces 3 questionnaires:

1er questionnaire:

catégorie 2.3	(1 personne)
catégorie 2.6	(1 personne)
<hr/>	
total	2 personnes

2e questionnaire:

catégorie 2.2	(1 personne)
catégorie 2.6	(1 personne)
<hr/>	
	2 personnes

3e questionnaire:

catégorie 2.2	(1 personne)
catégorie 2.4	(1 personne)
<hr/>	
	2 personnes

Table 6: Results for Question on Persons Left Out in the National Census Test (Step 4) and the 1986 Census (Question 8c).

<u>Results</u>	<u>NCT Step 4</u> (percent)	<u>1986 Census Question 8c</u> (percent)
Non-response	7.9	25.5
Yes	1.1	1.1
No	90.8	73.5

Tableau 7: Répartition des questionnaires pour lesquels étape 4a = "oui".

	Nbre de quest. non-pond.	%	Nbre de quest. pondéré	%
1. LES PERSONNES DEVRAIENT ETRE INSCRITES A L'ETAPE 6 ET ELLES LE SONT.				
1.1-Les personnes sont également inscrites à l'étape 2.				
1.1.1-Les personnes semblent avoir été ajoutées aux deux étapes par l'interviewer.	24 ¹	8.2	9165.757	8.8
1.1.2-Les personnes semblent avoir été inscrites aux deux étapes par le répondant.	7	2.4	1620.27	1.6
1.1.3-Les personnes semblent avoir été ajoutées à l'étape 2 par l'interviewer. Le répondant les avait déjà inscrits à l'étape 6.	5	1.7	781.458	0.8
1.1.4-Il est difficile de déterminer qui a fait les inscriptions.	2	0.7	315.33	0.3
1.2-Les personnes ne sont pas inscrites à l'étape 2.				
1.2.1-Les personnes semblent avoir été ajoutées à l'étape 6 par l'interviewer.	9	3.1	3767.476	3.6
1.2.2-Les personnes semblent avoir été ajoutées à l'étape 6 par le répondant.	7	2.4	1759.036	1.7
2. LES PERSONNES SEMBLENT DEVOIR ETRE INSCRITES A L'ETAPE 6, MAIS NE L'ONT PAS ETE.				
2.1-Les personnes semblent avoir été inscrites à l'étape 2 par le répondant.	1	0.3	500.66	0.5

2.2-Il est difficile de déterminer qui a fait les inscriptions à l'étape 2.	1	0.3	261.45	0.3
2.3-Les personnes ne sont pas inscrites à l'étape 2.	36 ²	12.4	13113.758	12.6
3.LES PERSONNES NE DEVRAIENT PAS ETRE INSCRITES A L'ETAPE 6 ET NE L'ONT PAS ETE.				
3.1-Résidents d'un établissement institutionnel pour 6 mois ou plus.	11	3.8	3259.812	3.1
3.2-Etudiants de niveau post-secondaire qui habitent ailleurs.	35	12.0	9145.428	8.8
3.3-Les personnes en question n'étaient pas dans le logement le jour du Test et n'habitent pas à cet endroit habituellement.	80 ³	27.5	30581.82	29.5
3.4-Animaux domestiques!	4	1.4	857.77	0.8
3.5-La personne en cause n'est pas encore né!	3	1.0	1049.82	1.0
3.6-La personne est décédée!	1	0.3	486.90	0.5
4.LES PERSONNES NE SEMBLANT PAS DEVOIR ETRE INSCRITES A L'ETAPE 6, MAIS L'ONT ETE.				
4.1-Résidents d'un établissement institutionnel pour 6 mois ou plus.	1	0.3	813.15	0.8
4.2-Etudiants de niveau post-secondaire qui habitent ailleurs.	9	3.1	3819.54	3.7
4.3-Les personnes en question n'étaient pas dans le logement le jour du Test et n'habitent pas à cet endroit habituellement.	3	1.0	1054.23	1.0

5.AUTRES				
5.1-Les raisons mentionnées ne nous permettent pas de classer le cas parmi ceux indiqués dans ce tableau.	14	4.8	5472.535	5.3
5.2-La case "oui" est cochée mais aucun nom et raison n'est indiqué.	30 ⁴	10.3	13232.909	12.8
5.3-La case "oui" n'était pas cochée.	4	1.4	2049.23	2.0
5.4-Plus de une personne avec cas distincts.	2 ⁵	0.7	187.34	0.2
5.5-Questionnaire introuvable.	2	0.7	461.659	0.4
TOTAL	291	100.0	103757.338	100.0

NOTES

TABEAU 7

- (1) Dans 2 de ces 24 questionnaires, les noms de l'étape 4 n'ont pu être ajoutés à l'étape 6, puisqu'il n'y avait pas de 2e questionnaire disponible.

Comme les noms avaient été inscrits à l'étape 2, on a supposé qu'ils auraient été inscrits à l'étape 6 s'il y avait eu de l'espace libre dans la matrice.

- (2) Dans 3 de ces 36 questionnaires, les noms de l'étape 4 ne se retrouvent pas à l'étape 6, car la matrice était déjà remplie. Comme ces noms ne sont également pas à l'étape 2, on a jugé qu'il n'aurait probablement pas été ajouté au reste du questionnaire.

Les personnes impliquées dans ces 36 questionnaires sont souvent des visiteurs qui ont passé la nuit du 3 au 4 novembre dans le logement en question, mais qui n'ont pas été ajoutés au questionnaire. Il semble qu'on ait jugé qu'ils ne devaient pas être inclus puisque ce ne sont pas des résidents habituels. Il s'agit souvent aussi de personnes ne faisant pas partie de la famille du répondant, mais habitant le logement (Ex. chambreur).

- (3) Les cas suivants se répètent le plus souvent. Il s'agit:

- (a) de l'ex-mari ou de l'ex-femme du répondant.
- (b) des enfants du répondant qui vivent ailleurs (chez l'ex-mari ou l'ex-femme ou dans un endroit totalement différent).
- (c) de visiteurs n'ayant pas passé la nuit du 3 au 4 novembre, mais ayant visité le ménage les jours entourant le Test du Recensement National.

- (4) Répartition de ces 30 questionnaires:

- 27 complétés par l'interviewer.
- 3 complétés par le répondant.

- (5) 1er questionnaire

La 1ère personne mentionnée à l'étape 4 n'a pas été inscrite à l'étape 2 et à l'étape 6, car il s'agit d'une étudiante à l'Université qui habite ailleurs. (3.2)

La 2e personne devait être inscrite à l'étape 2 et 6 et ce fut fait par le répondant. (1.1.2)

2e questionnaire

La 1ère personne devait être inscrite à l'étape 6 et 2 et elle l'est. Cette personne a été ajoutée aux deux étapes par l'interviewer. (1.1.1)

La 2e personne mentionnée à l'étape 4 n'a pas été ajoutée aux deux étapes, car elle ne se trouvait pas dans le logement le jour du Test et n'habite pas là habituellement. (3.3)

Table 8: Responses to Question 4 Prior to Field Edit and Follow-up (from Response Rate Sample Study).

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Non-response	4.6
Multiple response	9.1
Single response	86.2

Table 9: Responses to Question 4 After Field Edit and Follow-up.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Here (single)	24,416,356	94.27
No usual home (single)	39,262	0.15
Foreign resident (single)	83,568	0.32
Temporary resident (single)	413,098	1.59
Multiple: Here and address	696,288	2.69
Other multiple response	25,704	0.10
Non-response (including address only)	226,418	0.87
TOTAL	25,900,693	100.00

Table 10: Responses to Question 4 After Edit and Imputation.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Here	25,357,681	97.90
No usual home	45,861	0.18
Foreign resident	84,054	0.32
Temporary resident	413,098	1.59
TOTAL	25,900,693	100.00

Table 11: Type of Address for Temporary Residents in Question 4.

<u>Address Type</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Urban, exact	28.3
Rural, exact	11.6
No postal code, exact	16.2
Subtotal, exact	56.1
Urban, inexact	3.2
Rural, inexact	16.6
No postal code, inexact	21.1
Subtotal, inexact	40.9
No address	3.0
TOTAL	100.0

Table 12: Household Size Distribution - 10 Provinces.

<u>Size</u>	<u>Step 2</u>	<u>Question 4</u> <u>(All)</u>	<u>Question 4</u> <u>(Usual)</u>	<u>1986 Census</u>
. or 0	91,192	-	62,476	-
1	1,983,633	2,018,703	2,068,463	1,930,700
2	3,045,477	3,073,990	3,066,565	2,696,340
3	1,767,234	1,786,855	1,778,802	1,595,580
4	1,666,661	1,684,084	1,671,751	1,677,435
5	734,693	732,738	684,756	726,000
6	230,971	327,558	291,114	238,290
7	59,358	n.a.	n.a.	62,630
8	25,236	n.a.	n.a.	23,720
9	12,593	n.a.	n.a.	9,800
10+	6,879	n.a.	n.a.	9,450
TOTAL	9,623,926	9,623,926	9,623,926	8,969,945

<u>Size</u>	<u>Step 2</u>	<u>Question 4</u> <u>(All)</u>	<u>Question 4</u> <u>(Usual)</u>	<u>1986 Census</u>
All Sizes:				
Persons in House- holds	25,908,180	n.a.	n.a.	24,700,090
Average Size	2.7178 ¹	n.a.	n.a.	2.7537
For Sizes ≤ 5:				
Persons in House- holds	23,716,398	23,927,274	23,648,783	22,449,860
Average Size	2.5785 ¹	2.5738	2.5510 ¹	2.6026

¹ excluding households where size = . or 0

Table 13: Results for Question 1 (Other Persons Who Should Have Been Listed).

<u>Results</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
"No" to all categories	2285	88.9
Non-response to all categories	182	7.1
Combination of "No" or non-response	52	2.0
Subtotal, "No" or non-reponse	2519	98.0
"Yes" to other relative (single category)	17	0.7
"Yes" to away for some other reason (single category)	11	0.4
"Yes" to visitor who stayed overnight	10	0.4
"Yes" to roomers or boarders	4	0.2
Combination of more than one "Yes" answer	10	0.4
Subtotal, "Yes" response	52	2.0
TOTAL	2571	100.0

Table 14: Response to Question 1 by Persons Added Below the Line.

	Number of persons added						
	Blank	None	1	2	4	Total	
R q e u s e p s o t n i s o e n t 1 o	Blank	1	-	-	-	1	
	No addi- tions	-	2506	9	2	1	2518
	At least 1 person should be added	-	25	22	5	-	52
TOTAL	1	2531	31	7	1	2571	
Persons added	0	0	31	14	4	49	

Table 15: Consistency With Step 2 - Excluding Below the Line Additions.

	Step 2												
	.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL
R blank	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
e 1	3	1	505	13	10	7	2	1	-	-	1	-	543
i 2	8	1	9	799	63	100	38	7	-	-	-	-	1025
n 3	1	-	-	3	353	27	10	7	1	1	-	-	403
t 4	3	1	2	2	3	318	13	7	3	-	-	-	352
e 5	1	1	-	-	-	2	124	6	2	1	-	-	137
r 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	50	5	4	-	-	85
v 7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	15	-	-	-	16
i 8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5	-	-	6
e 9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
w 10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
TOTAL	17	4	516	817	429	454	213	80	26	11	2	2	2,571

Table 16: Usual Place of Residence (NCT) by Usual Place of Residence (Re-interview).

	NCT (After Edit & Imputation)					
	Here (Imputed)	Here (Response)	No usual home	Elsewhere in Canada	Outside Canada	TOTAL
Blank	107	444	1	15	-	567
Re i n t e r v i e w Here	87	5876	4	13	3	5983
No usual home	1	0	1	1	-	3
Elsewhere in Canada	6	8	-	58	2	74
Outside Canada	0	7	1	1	8	17
TOTAL	201	6335	7	88	13	6644

Table 17: Reason for Presence in Dwelling Nov 4/89 by Usual Place of Residence
(to be asked of Foreign and Temporary Residents only).

Reason							TOTAL	
	Blank	Visiting	Going to school	Working	Vacation here	Other reason		
Usual place of residence	Non response	542	18	0	5	2	0	567
	Here	5968	7	0	0	0	1	5976
	No usual home	5	2	0	0	0	0	7
	Elsewhere in Canada	5	30	25	2	5	8	75
	Outside Canada	4	8	4	1	1	1	19
TOTAL		6524	65	29	8	8	10	6644

Note: Usual place of residence is as reported in re-interview but before correction of data capture errors.

Appendix 2

Recommended Coverage Questions for 1991

On front cover (or immediately after Step 1):

To Temporary Residents

If all members of this household are Temporary Residents (that is, persons staying here temporarily who have a usual home somewhere else in Canada), enter the total number of temporary residents in this box.....[] and do not complete this questionnaire. Follow the return instructions indicated on the envelope which contained this questionnaire.

To Foreign Residents

If all members of this household are Foreign Residents (see below), mark here....[] and do not complete this questionnaire. Follow the return instructions indicated on the envelope which contained this questionnaire.

Foreign residents are persons in any of the following categories:

- government representatives of another country attached to the legation, embassy or other diplomatic body of that country in Canada, and their families;
- members of the Armed Forces of another country, and their families;
- residents of another country visiting in Canada temporarily.

(Note: the above definition reflects the proposed change that would now include students and work permit holders in the target population of the Census.)

Step 2 - Make a list of all persons who usually live here as of Tuesday, June 4th, including yourself.

List:

- all persons who usually live here, even if they are temporarily away (such as on business, at school or on vacation).
- all other persons who were staying or visiting here who have no usual home somewhere else.

Do Not List:

- persons away for six months or more in an institution, such as a hospital, home for the aged, penitentiary, etc.
- foreign residents (see front cover).

Begin the List With:

- either the husband, wife or common-law partner of a couple who usually live here;
- the parent, where only one parent lives with his or her never-married son(s) or daughter(s).

If neither of the above applies, begin with any adult member of this household.

	Family name	Given Name	Middle Initial
Person 1			
Person 2			
Person 3			
Person 4			
Person 5			
Person 6			
Person 7			
Person 8			
Person 9			
Person 10			
Person 11			
Person 12			

If you need more space, use the Comments section on back cover. []

Step 3 - Did you leave anyone out of Step 2 because you were not sure the person should be listed? For example, other relatives living here, a student away at school, a lodger who also has another home, live-in help, or member of this household who is away in an institution for six months or more?

☐ No

☐ Yes - Print the name of each person left out and the reason.

Name	Reason
------	--------

If you need more space, use the Comments section on back cover.

Step 4 - How many persons who have a usual home somewhere else in Canada stayed in this household overnight between June 3 and 4, 1991?

☐ None

OR

Number of persons []

Step 6 - Turn the page and copy the names from the list in Step 2 into the spaces across the top of the page.

If there are more than six persons in this household, enter the first six on this questionnaire and continue on a second questionnaire, starting with the seventh person in the column for "Person 2". If you do not have a second questionnaire, note this in the Comments section on back cover. A Census Representative will call to collect information on the other persons.

Then continue with the questionnaire.

STATISTICS CANADA LIBRARY
BIBLIOTHEQUE STATISTIQUE CANADA



1010343850

d.1

